DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 296 HE 011 961

AUTHOR Williams, Ben F.
TITLE Open Admissions at the City University of New York 1970: Its Implications for Higher Education.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Standards; Access to Education; *Admission Criteria; *College Students; Educational History; Higher Education; *Open Enrollment; *Public Education; Student Characteristics; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *City University of New York

ABSTRACT

Implications for higher education as a result of open admissions at City University of New York (CUNY) in 1970 are examined in this paper. After a brief general history of open admissions in higher education, a history of CUNY is presented. Preparations for open admission at CUNY are discussed and the six guidelines for the open admission, including the requirement that for admission to some university programs students have graduated from New York City high schools with an average of 80 percent or better, are listed. Tables detail facts concerning the entering class of 1970. The general results of open admissions are explored, and seven implications for higher education, including the need for skill development courses, are identified. Among personal observations cited were that many of the students who entered CUNY under the open admissions policy were no different academically from the regular students of previous years and that contrary to popular conception, the typical open admissions student was a white student from a working-class Catholic family. Appended are a list of tables and an 11-item bibliography. (PHR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED180296

OPEN ADMISSIONS AT THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK 1970: ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.

By
Ben R. Williams

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ben R. Williams
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A paper submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for 317-Changing Patterns In Higher Education.

University of Pittsburgh
1977

HE 011 961

ABSTRACT

The establishment of an open admissions policy at the City University of New York(CUNY) in 1970, was begun as an aftermath to violent urban frustration. The implications for higher education as a result of open admissions at CUNY in 1970 will be appraised and discussed in this paper. This subject is especially noteworthy during the current, national controversies over quotas, affirmative action programs and allegations of "reverse discrimination" presently confronting institutions in American society.

Introduction

On July 4, 1976, the United States celebrated its Bicentennial, marking 200 years of its existance as a "free" country. The United States in 1776, was founded upon the principles of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness for all. Yet after more than 200 years, a vast number of Americans still...do not have an equal chance to benefit from our nation's vast wealth of materialism and advancement opportunities. For millions of Americans, their celebration of the Bicentennial simply meant being reminded of a dream that has many times been deferred socially, politically and educationally.

The concept of open admissions at colleges is not radical...nor a new idea. Basically, the concept received its general foundation when the United States in 1776, itself was founded. And in 1862 as a results of the Morrill Act, this concept of equal opportunities to higher education continued to become an interwoven part of higher education.[1] The Morrill Act laid the legal ground work for the accessibility of some Americans to higher education in the United States. The present argument is intensified and heightened when it is debated as to "who" should have the opportunity to receive a higher education as a result of open admissions and "under what circumstances."

Public education in America has been partially and historically based on an educated trial and error approach. Our educational system has used this approach as a basis for many of its presently established instructional methods. Therefore it seems ironic for the system to expect total perfection from the initial adoption of a policy of open admissions for a limited period at a specific institution. The trial and error method of discovery has always had numerous failures, disillusionments or partial successes to contend with. Unfortunately, anything less than total success in all respects has simply established

itself presently as a "total" failure in the mind of many of its critics.

> On April 22, 1969, a group of students, most of them black, seized the South Campus of the City College of New York. In the popular mind, "city" is a fabled place. In the nineteen-thirties, the brightest high -school graduates could not find jobs, so many of them eked out a Depression existence and studied at C.U.N.Y. The school became known as a proletarian Harvard, the only elite institution ever owned by the man in the street. Now black radicals were attacking City College --and the entire City University of New York(CUNY) on the grounds that they discriminated against the poor and minorities. A mayoral campaign was in process and the handling of the issue immediately became the subject of intense politicial debate...[2]

The establishment of an open admissions policy at the City University of New York in 1970 was begun as an aftermath to violent urban frustration. Open admissions successes and failures carry with them a message for educators and society in general. Unless the American dream becomes a reality for all who wishes to pursue it... a violent American nightmare will become a result for many who do not deserve it.

> Against this tumultuous backdrop, the Board of Higher Education decided that it would initiated a program of Open Admissions--permitting every graduate of a New York high school to enroll in the City University--in 1970 rather than in 1975, as specified in a University Master Plan.[3]

The implications for higher education as a result of open admissions at the City University of New York in 1970 will be examined and discussed in this paper. This subject is especially noteworthy during the current, national controversies over quotas, affirmative action programs and "reverse discrimination" cases presently confronting institutions of higher education.

> ...Equal opportunity and the democratic right of all to education, which are part of the rationale of open admissions, were not foremost in the minds of the founding fathers of our early colleges. Harvard, the first of these colleges, founded in 1636, and later Yale, founded in 1701, were for the most part specialized training schools for the clergy, and the curriculum, borrowing from Oxford and Cambridge, was heavily and almost exclusively a classical one... Speaking in 1961, Arthur Howe, Jr., then Dean of Admissions at Yale, said: " a hundred years ago, that is, roughly 1870, some professors would line up applicants outside his study door, admit them one by one, put them through a stiff oral exam in Latin or Greek and tell them to come back the next day for his decision!"[4]

In the late 1770's Thomas Jefferson's ideas regarding the admitting of students to William and Mary were not totally democratic either. As a member of the Board of the College, he advocated that in order to be admitted to William and Mary, a competitive system that selected the best from the group was essentially the only way of maintaining selectivity.[5] Decades later the popularity of a grass roots philosophy called Jacksonian democracy paved the way for the beginnings of state universities and land-grant colleges. In 1862 after the establishment of land-grant colleges, a liberalized attitude toward admissions aided their popularity and this liberal admissions policy continued until after World War II.[6] After the war, enrollments increased and the liberalized admissions standards of the past were raised.

> Allen Nevins, in his 1962 lectures at the University of Illinois to mark the centennial of the Morrill Act, pointed out that at the beginning of the twentieth century many prestigious private colleges as well as the state universities were lenient with that majority of entrants who failed to meet the stipulated entrance requirements. He said that many colligiate institutions declared in effect, "we will allow you to try to do college work in the same classes with those who are truly prepared, and in addition, require you to make up your deficiencies." Harvard College, according to Nevins, said this to 58% of its 607 freshmen in 1908-09, and Yale said it in that year to 57% of its incoming class. Columbia College also said it that year to about the same proportion of applicants, and Princeton admitted 301 out of 360 freshmen with conditions. Undoubtly at this time as well as in later years, the sons of old grads, no matter how meager their intellectual talents, found entrance to Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and Columbia to be relatively easy...[4]

The admission standards of land-grant colleges were lower than those for the above mentioned private institutions. This was primarily due to the fact that land-grant colleges depended totally on large attendance to retain its financial base. Nevins stated that "as late as 1900, Georgia State College of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts' entrance requirements were practically non-existence."[5]

In the modern 1970 ies, a few educators once again have decided that after violent urban unrest and political pressures, to reconsider a limited form of open admissions. However this time, the recipentents are not farmers and mechanics, "whose education was foremost in the minds of Justin Morrill and Jonathan Turner, the originators of the idea of federal land grants to the states for the purposes of education."[6] The new recipentents of open admission policies are those Americans who have traditionally and historically been excluded from the main stream of higher education. They are the poor and minorities(blacks, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, and whites from poor socioeconomic backgrounds).

Open admissions at the City University of New York has been widely debated; however, its strengths and weaknesses have far reaching implications for the academic community as well as society in general. The concept of open admissions has a variety of definitions; however, for the purpose of this paper, the concept of open admissions relate primarily to standards of admissions. Other institutions that admit students to the freshmen year of college regardless of their academic record will be mentioned for comparison. City University of New York is one of the nation's largest universities. Due to the size of its enrollment and its open admission policy adopted in 1970, it will be discussed in detail. Open admissions policy at the City University of New York (CUNY), guaranteed that any person who graduated from a New York City high school was entitled to seek free higher education.[7] Occassionally the term "free access" is used as another phrase for

open admissions, however, free access does not refer exclusively to entrance standards but refer also to geographical location and cost.[8]

> Warren Willingham defined free access college as one that admits at least one-third of its freshmen from the bottom half of their high school class, charging no more than $400 annually and is within forty-five minutes commuting time from the student's home.[9]

As indicated earlier, the term, open admissions in this paper refers to changes in entrance standards. However other known academic institutions have a form of open admissions also eventhough, they are not exclusively and totally identifical to that of CUNY. Certain state universities, a special Rutgers University program, certain liberal arts colleges, Parsons College, Federal City College in Washington, D.C., and "free" universities all have a form of open admissions.[10] These institutions have admitted students to the freshmen year of studies regardless of their past academic record. The University of Kansas, Ohio State University, Montana State University and the University of Wyoming all practiced open admissions by continuing to admit all residents of their states who have graduated within their states from accredited high schools.[11]

Brief History of City University of New York

> The purpose of The City University of New York has been to provide free higher education to all qualified residents of New York City. The need for such an institution was recognized as early as 1847, when an act of the Legislature authorized a referendum to be held in June of that year to determine whether a free academy should be established in the City of New York. The vote was overwhelmingly in favor of the proposition...The Board of Education was able to acquire a site, erect a suitable building, assemble a faculty and admit the first class in January 1849. The Academy experienced slow steady growth through the last half of the 19th century under its first two presidents. In 1866 the name was changed by legislative act to, the College of the City of New York.

The governing body of the College, originally the Board of Education was replaced in 1900 by a Board of Trustees, appointed by the mayor and independent of the Board of Education. In 1926, a Board of Higher Education took over the functions of the Board of Trustees of this college and of Hunter College (founded in 1870 as the Normal College of the City of New York). In 1929 the coperate title of the new Board became "The College of the City of New York," and the name of this institution was changed to "The City College."

The City University if financed by the City of New York, fees and gifts. Some funds for research and special projects are provided by the Federal Government. Free tuition is provided for baccalaureate students who are qualified residents of the City. Tuitions fees are paid by all other students.

...Today the City University if composed of eleven colleges operated by the Board of Higher Education of New York City. The university includes Brooklyn, City, Hunter, and Queens Colleges, which offer both undergraduate and graduate programs, and York College, a four year liberal arts college. It includes Staten Island, Bronx, Kingsborough Community Colleges and the New York City Community College of Applied Arts and Sciences. 12

Preparations for Open Admissions

The Board of Education of the City University of New York on July 9, 1969, announced that the University would adopt an open admissions policy in the fall of 1970.[13] Contrary to popular publicity and opinion, this procedure did not represent a total reversal of the University's previous policy. As early as February 1966, the Board had proclaimed that within the next 15 years, the University would adopt "100 percent" enrollment, or open admissions.[14] A master plan had been developed in 1968, which specified that open admissions would become a reality in the fall of 1975. It had been felt that the intervening period would allow the University time to prepare for this policy. However, urban campus unrest, especially directed toward the University resulted in a accelerated adoption of the beginning date. Guidelines for open admissions were developed and generally required the following:

1. Admissions to some university programs required applicants be graduates of New York City high schools and have an average of 80% or higher.

2. Students requiring remedial and other supportive services would receive them.
3. The enhancement to the standards of academic excellence of the University will be maintained.
4. Ethnic integration of the college will be the results.
5. Mobility of students between specific programs of the University will result.
6. Previously admitted students to various community or senior colleges shall still be so admitted.[15]

The Board and a University Task Force held hearings regarding the open admissions policy and one month later, a list of agreed upon guidelines were announced. During the remaining months of the 1969-1970 academic year, the individual CUNY colleges continued to prepare for September 1970.

The Task Force on Open Admissions had recommended certain standardized procedures. Among these were the development of a single organizational structure for handling remedial services, counseling, placement, orientation etc. Other than this, the colleges were relatively free to develop their own programs.

The results of these general guidelines led to two approaches. Some colleges, faculty and adminstrators spent a great deal of time preparing for open admissions. And of course, others did very little in preparing and simply continued with their general academic routines.

The general population of prospective students qualifying as Freshmen at CUNY in 1970 threatened to be enormous! The 1970 New York City high school graduates consisted of:

New York City high school graduates [16]

41,400	from public academies	50% academic diplomas
5,500	from public vocational	15% " "
21,500	from non-public	90% " "
68,400		

The total figure of about 70,000 high school graduates has not changed much in recent years and was expected to hold for the 1970s.[17]

As noted non-public schools produced annually half of the total of academic diplomas.

The final preparations for open admissions required a standardized organizational structure responsible for counseling, remediation, grading and data collection.

CUNY colleges employed two basic approaches to counseling. The first was the case-load approach. This approach entailed from 75 to 250 students being assigned to counselors. The second approach was the self-referral method that left it up to the student to seek counseling... if desired.

Students needing academic remedial training for specific courses were assisted in different ways. Some colleges established seperate remedial courses with little or no academic credit. Others placed poorly academically prepared students in smaller classes. Still others placed these students in regular classes but required them to meet for additional hours each week, to receive extra help. Special courses in English, mathematics and reading were geared toward individualized self-help and were also available to students.

Profile of a Class

Several thousand young people began their first year studies at CUNY during the fall of 1970.[18] For most of these students, it was their first time ever on a college campus, eventhough many of them lived in the nearby areas. This change in the campus population was made on a quota basis. A certain number of students with high school averages below seventy were assigned to four year colleges that normally accepted only those freshmen with averages higher than eight-six. Before the adoption of the open admissions policy in 1970, any student who applied at CUNY, but had a low high school average, went to a community college within the city. It was hoped that the changes in admissions would cause more minority students to enter the University also.

As a result, the distribution of New York City high school graduates, class of 1970, by over all grade average looked like this:

TABLE -1
Total averages of the class

	% over 80%	80% to 70%	under 70%
Black	16	52	32
Puerto Rican	24	58	18
White	50	40	10
Oriental & others	53	36	11
Total group	44	43	13

Figures in Table -1 indicate that 44% of the total 1970 class had averages of over 80%.[19]

TABLE -2
Percentage of New York City high school graduates

		% to other colleges	% to CUNY
Total group graduating	1969	57	30
Total group graduating	1970	76	48
National group graduating	1970	55-60	
For 1970			
From public academic high schools		75	55
From public vocational high schools		67	59
From non-public high schools		79	43
Academic averages over 80%		92	37
Academic averages under 70%		54	54
Men		84	
Women		70	

Table -2 shows the percentage of those graduates choosing CUNY or any college.

1. Rate of those going to college increased from 57% in 1969 to 76% in 1970.

2. CUNY's share of graduates increased from 30% to 48%.[20]

TABLE -3
Ethnic Census of 1970 City University of New York Freshmen in %

1970 High School Graduates	1967	1968	1969	1970
Black	6.5	9.3	13.7	17.1
Puerto Rican	4.0	5.0	5.9	7.7
Others	89.5	85.7	80.4	75.2

21

TABLE -4
Ethnic Census of 1970 City University of New York Freshmen by College (%)

	Four-year Colleges		Two-year Colleges	
	1969	1970	1969	1970
Blacks	12.0	14.8	16.5	21.0
Puerto Rican	4.8	6.6	7.7	9.6
Others	83.2	78.6	75.8	69.4

22

TABLE -5
Remedial Needs of Entering City University of New York Freshmen

	Number tested	% needing some remedial		% needing "intense" remedial	
		Reading	Math	Reading	Math
May 1970	31,634	41	26	10	25
May 1971	28,168	43	29	13	30

23

It is totally impossible to give simple statements about the characteristics of the Class of 1974 at CUNY. However, a few of these are listed below:

1. Most were 18 years old, just out of high school, and living at home with their families.
2. Generally, their parents had only a high school education and the total family income was under $12,500. More than half of the freshmen expressed at least some concern about their ability to finance their college education, and one-third expected that they would have to work at outside jobs while in college.
3. Four-fifths were white, one-third Jewish, close to half were Catholic, two-fifths from families in which another language besides English was spoken.
4. Four-fifths had taken academic programs in high schools; half had earned B averages.
5. Their reasons for going to college were based in large part on such particular considerations as better jobs and greater earning power in the future, although many cited such reasons as futhering their education and appreciation of ideas.
6. CUNY's reputation and free tuition led them to the campus. And a good many acknowledged that they probably would not have been able to get into college had it not been for open admissions.

7. CUNY students had high degree aspirations, over half expected to get post bacculaureate degrees...
8. CUNY students placed emphasis on such goals as developing a philosophy of life, helping others etc.[24]

General Results of Open Admissions

When open admissions first began, it was generally thought that the new students, especially those from the ghetto schools would need remediation. Once the new students arrived at CUNY especially those from ghetto high schools, their academic deficiencies were alarming. Their reading comprehension level was often low; they had never been taught how to write a well organized paper, take notes or do research.[25] These students previously had little training in critical thinking or in being their own critic. The University urged its branches to deal with these problems in their own way. The results revealed an enormous variety of approaches to the problem of skill development.

From the surface, the diversified approaches seem to be a good idea. Despite the effort to deal with the problem of skill development, the plain fact emerged that CUNY's efforts had been poorly inadequate. A theoretical commitment to open admissions students by CUNY had been made. However, it was clearly not enough! At best many students were only given minimal help with skill development problems. Several schools ignored the problem altogether and simply placed open admissions students in regular courses and left them to fend for themselves. Still others placed students in regular classes at first; then, left it up to the teacher to arrange for supportive services if needed.[26]

The assessment of a major change in admissions policy at an educational institution is not an easy task to evaluate. And this assessment is significantly complicated whenever the academic institution is as vast and complexed as CUNY. To some, meaningful evaluation cannot take place until

at least a decade has passed. However, it is obvious too, that if new programs in higher education are to be adjusted to, early evaluation is essential. Early evaluation in this instance cannot be listed under a ten point heading. Statistically, graphs and other measurers of achievements must be used in analyzing the results of the highly publicized open admissions policy at CUNY in 1970. Many of the outcomes of this policy are still being evaluated and debated. The results both positive and negative will vary depending upon the individual and point of view being expressed. The final question will be how well the students are accepted as contributors to society. A great deal of time, study and evaluation will be required before the questions of success and failure can be answered.

A main reason why debate over open admissions has often been unproductive is that neither its advocates nor its opponents have made clear their conception of the goals of higher education. Among the advocates and opponents of open admissions, there exists three basic ideas regarding higher education. They are the ideas of "the elitist, the egalitarian and the remedial."[27]

> Those who subscribe to an elitist conception of the system maintain that only the ablest and brightest should receive higher education. Those who advocate an egalitarian plan believe that everyone should have an opportunity to go to college, and that the investment of resources should be about equal across the spectrum of ability. Finally, advocates of a remedial or "social welfare" plan feel that special attention should be devoted to the lowest-performing and most disadvantaged members of society.[28]

Finally, what happened at CUNY was unique in numerous ways, especially since CUNY is one of the largest city universities in the world. During this process CUNY, a public "multiversity, moved from a semielitist to an egalitarian apporach with an emphasis on remediation."[29] During 1969 when the Board of Higher Education made the decision, the media presented the open admissions policy as a revolutionary, negative

approach to education. CUNY is also unique in that few...if any public institutions have ever before moved from restrictive to open admissions. And, its no tuition policy, "the racial/ethnic diversity of its students (fewer than 15 percent comes from WASP backgrounds)."[30] "Finally, because CUNY has frequently been the target of criticism by city and state politicains, it exemplifies the delicate and highly sensitive position that public institutions now occupy in our highly politicized society."[31]

Open Admissions at CUNY - Implications for Higher Education

Open admissions' successes and failures are a realistic reflection of current American college and university policies. The kind of commitment necessary for a successful program involved a complete re-evaluation of the traditional procedures of American college and universities.

First, the traditional college curriculum teaches basically content. It does not help the student develop the skills he needs to deal with that basic content. Also it should be realized that tutoring arrangements are not enough to handle difficult skill development problems. It's not enough to wait until a student is failing and needs to be helped before serious attention is given.

Secondly, it is obvious that many of the problems incurred by individual students attending CUNY as a results of open admissions, would have been minor obstacles if skill development courses had been a part of their curriculum. The skill development courses should have been seperate classes, consisting only of open admissions students who needed academic help. Ordinarily, colleges shy away from this fact reasoning that this weakens their high standards.[32] Often this reasoning takes on racist implications because it automatically assumes that Black urban

students cannot do what white middle class students can do. Three answers to this question are offered: First, open admissions and situations similar, involve also a large number of white students with weak academic backgrounds. They could have benefited just as much from skill development courses. Secondly, needed also were comprehensive testing systems to determine which students needed specific help. If the accepted idea that ghetto schools are generally academically inferior, it is unrealistic and unfair to expect graduates of ghetto schools to have the same skills as the white middle class students. And thirdly, the traditional methods of conducting remedial education as presented at CUNY was stereotyped from its inception. Students needing remedial training were often considered stupid.[33] Those students were also often mentally classified by themselves as dummies. Thus it was generally perceived that these students would be less knowledgable, less capable, less important and more troublesome.[34]

To overcome many of the problems arising from developmental skills, one specific correction must be made. An entirely new curriculum must be developed to effectively introduce, explore and develop three areas: these are reading comprehension, writing and abstract thinking.

Fourth, this re-evaluation of traditional techniques should focus a great deal of attention on motivation. First, we need to discard the boring and non imaginative exercises of the past and replace them with exciting, modern ones that give students a sense of anxiousness. Secondly, credit of some type must be attached to remedial work if it is realistically expected to aid students.

Fifth, a critical appraisal of teachers and adminstrators taking part in a program of this type must be considered seriously. They must be able to seriously relate to students and understand the problems they

face. They must be willing to spend a great deal of time with students outside of class. And they must be excited about the material they teach.

Six, provisions for individualized help for students on a one-to-one basis must be made. A vast number of people fail to realize that ghetto students are often isolated from the usual grapevine of information about teachers and courses that exist among middle class students.

Seven, qualifying and needy students must be given financial aid so that the daily expenses of an education will not place an additional burden upon them.

In addition to the previously stated implications for higher education, a program or concept such as this requires adequate funding. If a program such as open admissions is seriously concerned about the many years of academic deprivation that many of the inner city students have had to endure, we are going to need to hire qualified teachers. These are teachers who are as much concerned with what and how students learn as they are about receiving their bi-monthly pay checks. The contributors to learning are also important, small classes, tutoring and counselling. Such a program would be expensive, but it should be remembered that not all students need such a program. And most important, it is futile and foolish to proceed with a system that is only going to perpetuate the social inequity it seeks to rectify.

Trends for Society - Present and Future

The most prevailing trend of open admissions was it carried the principle of equal opportunity into the university.[35] It attempted to rescure as many people as possible from various social handicaps. It recognized that society's deck is heavily stacked against anyone--black, brown or white... who grew up in the ghetto. And most important, open admissions asked the vital question? Does society have the right to place a premium on a

college degree without putting this degree within reach of every student?

Personal Observations

Open admissions at CUNY in 1970 proved to be a direct reflection and amplifier of American society. This policy became the center of debate locally, state wide and on a national level. Open admissions at CUNY was the direct results of intense pressures brought upon CUNY by urban blacks, totally dissatisfied with its past policies of exclusion from its educational processes.[36]

The media played upon the public's fears and ideas of traditional education, to gain support for its view that open admissions at CUNY was a black, invasion of the campus.[37] As stated earlier, the pioneering idea of open admissions, that of equal opportunity had its origin in American educational philosophy in 1362. The Morrill Act laid the foundation for land-grant colleges that emphasized vocational training and community service.[38] Yet in modern times of electronic gadetry and space age travel, the system of American higher education continues to exclude some major segments of society. Primarily excluded are blacks, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, American Indians, and whites from poor socioeconomic backgrounds.[39]

As soon as the open admissions plan became official, rumors began to circulate throughout CUNY. Liberal and radical elements charged that the program was designed by cynical conservatives as a "revolving door" through which disadvantaged students would pass briefly before flunking out. Conservatives blamed liberals for the adoption of open admissions and predicted at all-engulfing "torrents of illiterate black and Puerto Ricans."[40] They further predicted the flight of CUNY's qualified students (middle class whites) to other schools and the general destruction of academic standards throughout the university.

As it turned out, neither the left nor the right were completely correct. Many of the students who entered CUNY under the open admissions policy, were not academically suffering any worse than regular students of previous years.

Open admissions and similar programs require a vast amount of pre-planning adminstratively, educationally, socially and community involving, ...if they are to be a success. Unfortunately CUNY had not made these changes and there presently are human forces at work that have almost completely eliminated the possibility of change in the near future. Inadequate funds in the most obvious barrier but several other glaring factors stand out also. The most prevailing factor is one that arises whenever a program involves a large number of black students is introduced on a basically white campus. Educational issues become directly tied to a series of emotional, political and deep racial issues. The results is that decisions are made not on the basis of education, but on the basis of politics, ambitions and all tempered with racial overtones.

Many members of the faculty at CUNY felt from the beginning that the entire concept on open admissions was foolish and pointless. Their usual arguement was that "those students" could never succeed in the academic world. Thus many of the open admissions students were forced to be taught by faculty members who did not academically believe in their capabilities and were simply in the process of proving their point of view.

The lack of substantial information about open admissions is another obstacle to change at CUNY. A prevailing myth of the past and present is that open admissions was a"Black Program." The reality was exactly the opposite.

> In point of fact, the most typical open admissions student was white, from a working-class Catholic family. Further, of the 7,000 Black students who entered CUNY last year as freshmen, some 5500 would have been accepted without open admissions--approxiamately 2,000 under the traditional acceptance procedure and another 3,500 under already existing programs such as Operation SEEK and College Discovery. This means that in its first year of operation, open admissions directly effected only 1,500 Black students.41

Another myth that permeated CUNY was that the highly qualified students would avoid the University after the adoption of open admissions. This fear was so prevalent that plans were prepared to "allow talented high school juniors to skip their senior year and enroll as CUNY freshmen.[42] Just the opposite occurred and highly qualified student's enrollment continued unaffected.

The problem of lack of communication was also a negative factor concerning open admissions among CUNY colleges. Related information among CUNY branches was never shared and it was seldom that one branch was ever aware of what the other was doing. Programs were forced to work in vacuums and there existed little chance for experimentation or information sharing.

In summary, open admissions at CUNY was poorly prepared for by most of the individuals involved, both directly and indirectly. Unfortunately, the mass media also focused on negative elements and combined them with the explosive mixture of politics and racial fears to present a picture of mass invasion by "those people". One wonders if the open admissions policies had effected any other groups whether or not a more favorable outcome would have resulted? Open admissions at CUNY, I believe has been one of the most important recent, encouraging developments in higher education. If higher education is to benefit from the experimental method of discovery rather than basing its primary emphasis on the trial and error approach, it should benefit greatly from this inovation. Open admissions challenged

some of America's most traditional assumptions about the role of the university. However it is still apparent that the provisions associated with the Morrill Act of 1862 have not as yet been seriously incooperated into the totally philosophies, adminstration and teaching methods of most American colleges and universities.

Footnotes

[1]Alan Griffin, " Land-Grant College or University," World Book Encyclopedia, 1974 ed., XII, 57.

[2]Michael Harrington, "Keep Open Admissions Open," New York Times, Nov. 2, 1975, pp. 16-17+.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Seymour Hyman, "Varieties of Open Admissions," Open Admissions: the Pros and Cons. (Washington: Council for Basic Books, 1972), p.1.

[5]Ibid., p. 2.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Ibid., p. 3.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Betsy Kaufman, "A Semantic Analysis of Open Admissions," Integrated Education, XIV (May, 1976), 11.

[11]Hyman., op. cit., p. 4.

[12]Ibid.

[13]Ibid., p. 5.

[14]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, "Higher Education," A Chance to Learn (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970), p. 11.

[15]City University of New York, "History of the City University," The City University of New York Bulletin, 1975-76, p. 8.

[16]Jack Rossman, et al, "Preparations for Open Admissions," Open Admissions at City University of New York - An Analysis of the First Year, (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1975), p. 8.

[17]Ibid.

[18]Ibid., p. 9.

[19]Hyman., op. cit., p. 12.

[20]Ibid.

[21] Harrington., op. cit.

[22] Hyman., op. cit., p. 13.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Ibid., p. 15.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Ibid., p. 16.

[27] Hyman., op. cit., p. 31.

[28] "Open Admissions or Failure?" Time Education Supplement, XVI (March 8, 1974), 3067.

[29] Kaufman., op. cit., p. 12.

[30] Hyman., op. cit., p. 166.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Hyman, 167.

[34] Kaufman., op. cit.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Ibid., p. 13.

[37] Robert Moss, "Did I Improve Any Better? The Plight of the Disadvantaged Student Under Seek and Open Admissions," Journal of General Education, XXV (April 1973), 7.

[38] Harrington., op. cit.

[39] Griffin., op. cit.

[40] Laurence Foss, "Open Door Education: Bringing the Street-Corner to the College," Community and Junior College Journal XLIII (March 1973), 18.

[41] Moss., op. cit.

[42] Barbara Kaplan, "Open Admissions: A Crique," Liberal Education LVIII (May 1972), p. 220.

APPENDIX

LISTS OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Total Averages of a Class	9
2.	Percentage of New York City High School Graduates	9
3.	Census of 1970 CUNY Freshmen in Percentages	10
4.	Ethnic Census of 1970 CUNY Freshmen by College in Percentages	10
5.	Remedial Needs of Entering CUNY Freshmen	10

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, "Higher Education," A Chance to Learn. New York: Mc Graw-Hill, 1970.

City University of New York, "History of the City University," The City University of New York Bulletin, 1975-76.

Foss, Laurence, "Open Door Education: Bringing the Street corner to the college," Community and Junior College Journal, XLIII (March 1973), 18-19.

Furness, W. Todd, Higher Education for Everybody? Issues and Implications. Washighton,D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

Griffin, Alan, "Land-grant Colleges or University," World Book Encyclopedia. 1974 ed., Vol. XII.

Harrington, Michael, "Keep Open Admissions Open," New York Times. Nov. 2, 1975.

Hyman, Seymour, "Varieties of Open Admissions," Open Admissions: the Pros and Cons. Washington,D.C.: Council for Basic Books, 1972.

Kaufman, Betsy, "A Semantic Analysis of Open Admissions," Integrated Education, XIV (May 1976), 11.

Moss, Robert, "Did I Improve Any Better? The Plight of the Disadvantaged Student Under SEEK Under Open Admissions," Journal of General Education. XXV (April 1973), 1-16.

"Open Admissions or Failure?" Time Education Supplement, 3067 (March 8, 1974), 16.

Rossman, Jack; Austin, Helen S.; Austin Alexander; and El-Khawas, Elaine W., "Preparations for Open Admissions," Open Admissions at City University of New York - An Analysis of the First Year. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1975.